THE Reconstructionist

olume XI. October 5, 1945 Tishri 28, 5706 No. 10

EDITORIALS
- *The Atomic Bomb and the Peace*
- *Can Judaism Survive in Europe?*
- *British Betrayal*
- *American Jewish Life "As Usual"*

THE ALL-DAY JEWISH SCHOOL — *By Samuel Dinin*

IS ORTHODOXY CONSISTENT WITH DEMOCRACY? — *By Sidney Morgenbesser*

THE LAW (Poem) — *By Alice Seligsberg*

REALITIES AND VALUES

CORRESPONDENCE

edicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of rael's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**

Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**

Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: Israel S. Chipkin, Nathan E. **Cohen, Samuel Dinin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Solomon Goldman, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton R. Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield,** Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer **J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Robert Gordis, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, David Polish, Edward T. Sandrow, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMOUNG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

SIDNEY MORGENBESSER is director of the Hillel Foundation at Queens College, New York.

ALICE SELIGSBERG was one of the founders of Hadassah and established the first medical unit in Palestine. A prominent social worker, deeply interested in child welfare, she organized the orphan work in Palestine for J.D.C. after World War I.

READY NOW!

RECONSTRUCTIONIST DIARIES
for 5706 - 1945-46

Complete Jewish-English Calendar

A Reconstructionist Diary is indispensable

Order your diary now.

Thirty cents each

SAVE THE DATES!

Saturday evening, October 13th
Sunday (all day and evening), October 14th

for

THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE

of

The JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.

at Hotel McAlpin, 34th St. and Broadway, N. Y.

SOME OF THE FEATURES:

Addresses by

DR. MORDECAI M. KAPLAN
DR. JOSHUA L. LIEBMAN, Boston, Mass.
RABBI MYER KRIPKE, New London, Conn.
DR. JOSEPH BLAU.
DR. ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN.
DR. SAMUEL C. KOHS.

Presentation of cantata WHAT IS TORAH by the Kvutza Group of the East Midwood Jewish Center, Brooklyn, on Sunday afternoon.

Annual meeting of the Foundation on Sunday morning.

for further details write

The JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.

15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

THE

Reconstructionist

Volume XI. October 5, 1945 Tishri 28, 5706 No. 10

EDITORIALS

THE ATOMIC BOMB AND THE PEACE

SINCE the publication of our last issue in the spring, two events of epoch-making importance have occurred, the termination of the war and the use of the atomic bomb. Their near coincidence is significant. It points to the very crux of the problem that confronts the world at the present moment. It should drive home the realization that our statesmen and the peoples they represent must choose between having "one world" or none at all, a world civilization or a return to savagery.

Men everywhere have responded to the news of the atomic bomb with fear. By a strange irony of fate, the ingenious mind of man, which has unlocked the mysteries of nature in a way that puts its tremendous powers at his disposal, now cowers in fear before the powers it has unleashed. Man, the lord of Creation, is afraid — of himself. He is aware that he possesses more power than he knows how to use to his advantage and is in terror lest he use it to his own ultimate destruction.

We see here the inadequacy of science to effect the salvation of man. It can give him control over everything but himself. His ultimate salvation depends on his relation to the Power that makes for righteousness. For his spiritual orientation he must look to religion.

But for religion also the invention of the atomic bomb poses a problem. How can we reconcile such a consummation of centuries of scientific endeavor by the best intelligence of the race with our belief in God? Our religion maintains that the powers of the human mind are a manifestation of God's grace, that God is He who "graciously bestows knowledge on man and teaches mortals understanding." How then shall we reckon with the fact that the more man progresses in science and invention, the more he seems to jeopardize his own security? Jewish religion has always maintained that history demonstrates the sovereignty of God and that its course leads inevitably to the day "when injustice shall be silenced and all wickedness vanish like smoke," when all the nations "shall become a united band wholeheartedly carrying out the will of God," when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation and men shall no longer learn warfare." But the atomic bomb holds out a totally different prospect, that of a tragic reversion to chaos, an uncreating of the moral order, the

hegemony of the "dominion of arrogance."

This dilemma, however, can be resolved in the spirit of prophetic faith. The prophets foresaw disaster for their world while yet the people were complacent and incredulous of the impending menace. But they never wavered in their faith in the ultimate issue of the struggle between good and evil. When the moral law was flouted, disaster ensued as an inexorable retribution, but that retribution, as the prophets understood it, was designed to restore the moral balance, to recall mankind to its senses, and to clear the way for the eventual establishment of God's kingdom on earth.

To interpret the significance of the atomic bomb in the spirit of the prophetic traditon, we must view the problem in a broad perspective that takes in both the realities about man's past revealed by science and the intuitive insights as to man's destiny maintained by religion. Man, according to the scientific view, has had a long animal ancestry going back to the earliest forms of animal life on this planet. In the evolutionary process, man is a new and young species. Nevertheless, he possesses mental powers so far in excess of those of any other species that he seems definitely on the way to becoming an entirely different order of being. His superior intelligence has enabled him to free himself from dependence on his immediate natural environment and to modify that environment to meet his needs. But greater independence always means greater risk. The embryo in the womb is safer than the infant after birth; the infant in its mother's arms is safer than the child who can walk about and get into mischief; and the child, whose wants are provided for him by his parents and the adult community, is safer than the adult who has to shift for himself. Every increase in freedom and power involves an increase in responsibility and danger. Nevertheless evolution cannot be avoided. We cannot retain the security of childhood by refusing to grow up. We must evolve by envisaging the perils of our existence and acquiring the wisdom and resourcefulness to avert them. Thus a divine urge impels us to fulfil a destiny which necessitates a growth in self-control to keep pace with every accession of power.

Jewish religion accepts and affirms this life process which keeps goading us to ever higher reaches of achievement. It does not shut its eyes to the dangers that waylay the unsuspecting, but it sees in them an incentive to seek the right path, not a token of ultimate futility. Other religions may despair of the world and content themselves with saving individual souls from the general debacle which is the inevitable doom imposed on mankind for its sinfulness; not so the Jewish religion; it has confidence that the same Power that has made possible man's emergence from the brute makes possible man's achievement of a humane spirit and a fraternal society. Man need but apply intelligently and conscientiously the powers with which God has endowed him. "Life and death have I set before you, the blessing and the curse; therefore, choose life."

This is the choice which the atomic bomb presents to us. It is silly to talk of not using man's power over the atom. Life will not permit us to crawl back into the security of the womb. It is folly and madness to try to keep the atomic bomb a national monopoly; we have no monopoly on scientific knowledge, and international competition in the production of the latest and most destructive weapon of war can only lead to a future war from which mankind may never recover. But if the fear of the atomic bomb makes mankind realize the anachronism of

bsolute national sovereignty, if it im-resses on men the need for formulating nd implementing an international law nd an international government found-d on justice and peace, it may prove the lvation of mankind. Let the fear of te atomic bomb be converted into that ear of God" which is synonymous with te "fear of sin" and it may turn out at the atomic bomb has blasted a high-ay for our God.

AN JUDAISM SURVIVE EUROPE?

A YOUNG Jewish writer from Poland, who was re-ntly freed from the Buchenwald Camp quoted by *Zukunft* (August, 1945) expressing in the following words his ubts about Jewish survival in Poland: There emerges the thought that I am ung. . . . And if I want to live, I shall ave to become a different person. . . . y soul may cry in me—but I will be rced to turn to the language of the untry and its culture, because, with irty thousand Jews scattered over all rts of the land, with their souls torn inner conflict and de-Judaized to a rge extent, you cannot build a new Jew-n cultural tradition in Poland."

This question of the possibility of cul-ral survival for European Jewry concerns t only the young writer from the Buch-wald Camp. Can, inded, the Jewish pulation of Poland, which now consti-tes less than one-half per cent of the neral population, develop its own cul-ral life? The same question might, of urse, also be asked about the physical rvival of Polish Jewry. Will such a all minority, consisting of poverty-icken people, many of them physically d mentally broken, be able to start a w life? The problem is complicated by e deep hatred against the Jews with which the Germans have poisoned the minds of the people. This situation in Poland leads to pogroms and armed attacks against Jews, so that hundreds of them have tried to return to the camps in the American and British zones of Germany. No one is able to predict what will be the ultimate policy in regard to Jews and Jewishness in the Eastern European countries which are under Soviet influence (Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia), and in which about three-quarters of a million surviving European Jews are concentrated. So far no policies have been formulated. While in Carpatho-Russia, which was absorbed in the Soviet Ukraine, Hebrew and Zionism are forbidden, in Rumania and Poland it is still possible to develop Jewish culture, although there, too, some of the Jewish communists do not cease to assail Jewish nationalism.

There are among the Zionists those who flatly deny the possibility of Jewish survival in Europe. According to them, Palestine alone affords a possibility for these Jews to live a normal life.

In the meantime the chances of early admittance to Palestine for all these Jews are still in doubt, and help is being rushed to the spot by the Joint Distribution Committee, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Vaad Hahatzalah and other organizations. Many *landsmanshaften* and American groups composed of people originating in particular European localities are making efforts to help the Jews of the communities where these Americans formerly lived.

Of course, our first concern must be for the physical survival of the Jews in the different European countires. This must be insured by the help of the United Nations and by the support of Jewish organizations. But American Jews must keep in mind also the problem of the group

survival of European Jewry. This is not merely a question of supplying material for spiritual, religious and cultural needs, such as books and *taletim*, it is more a question of attitude and spiritual relationship. The Polish-Jewish writer cited above came to question the possibility of Jewish survival in Poland as a result of the attitude of World Jewry. "Plain instinct," he writes, "declares: You must give up your Jewish life, resign from Jewish literature and culture; the world, the Jewish world, is an old deaf woman."

American Jewry, with its diverse organizations, is doing its share in rescue work. Directors and representatives are flying to Europe; social workers are being dispatched; food and clothing are being shipped. Culturally, also, something is being done. Books are being collected and book funds established; the reappearance of Jewish publications is being facilitated.

The money raised for this relief work may amount to a gigantic sum. But the amount that reaches the beneficiaries is necessarily only a part of that total. Furthermore, when compared with the needs of the recipients, it appears small indeed.

Even graver is the problem of the type of "representatives" who are going overseas to help European Jewry. They may be good social workers, executives or politicians; they may be competent to give bread to the hungry and clothes to the naked and even to distribute books; but rarely are they qualified to heal the soul of the sufferer, to bring the hope for survival and energy for a new struggle for Jewish culture and Jewish life.

The small remnants of European Jewry will be able to strive for Jewish survival only if they are made to feel that the large Jewish populations — American Jewry and the Palestine Yishuv—have a deep interest in them and in their lot. And this feeling cannot be instilled by material help only, necessary as that is, but by a manifestation of the readiness of the rest of Jewry to help them build up their broken lives and preserve their cultural tradition. The representatives who come in contact with European Jewry must, first of all, have a "Jewish heart." They must also *understand the language,* of the people (both literally and figuratively) and share their problems. Above all, however, they themselves should be survivalist Jews, interested in the perpetuation of Jewish group life, and ready, by their own sacrifices if necessary, to help build up new Jewish cultural and spiritual values.

BRITISH BETRAYAL

THE Jewish people was the first to be attacked by the Nazis. The Jewish people had proportionately the highest casualty rate of any in the war, for it lost to the Axis powers, through murder, starvation, suicide and war, almost a third of its entire population. The Jewish people had every right to expect that, after the war, the healing of its wounds, the restoration of its honor, the guarantee of its security would be among the first considerations of the peace.

But we have apparently been betrayed, and betrayed by a British government, representing the Labor Party which stands committed by its own platform to the fulfilment of the British pledge to our people.

The British Cabinet, notwithstanding an appeal by President Truman for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, seems to have decided to keep the White Paper in force, with minor modifications, to admit only a trickle of Jewish immigration — 1,500 a month —

and to refer the final disposition of Palestine to the United Nations Organization.

In the meantime, Jews are still in concentration camps in Europe, where they are dying in great numbers from prolonged starvation and diseases without even a ray of hope being held out to them. Many are threatened with pogroms if they return to their former homes in Poland and other countries. None of them has any chance of a decent livelihood in the morally poisoned atmosphere of Europe. No country wants them except Jewish Palestine; and Great Britain, which is morally and legally entrusted with the mandate to facilitate the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine, will not permit them to enter it.

For what is Great Britain waiting? Is she waiting till all the Jews of Europe have been exterminated, so that she can say there is no more Jewish problem which needs Palestine as its solution?

No doubt we will be told to be patient. We will be asked to believe that Great Britain is only seeking international support for a plan that will do justice to the Jews. Has not the government proposed to refer the situation to the United Nations Organizaton? Surely the Jews, being an international people, cannot object to submitting to international control.

We have been patient, but to continue patient at the cost of Jewish lives and Jewish honor would be a base dereliction of duty. If Great Britain wants us to entrust our future to international commitments, let her keep the commitments that she has already made. The White Paper policy was never approved by the League of Nations, yet Great Britain, acting unilaterally, proceeded to implement it. Until that policy is renounced, we can rely on no promises. The time for promises is over; now is the time for fulfilment.

We have been patient. As long as the war lasted, and the governments of Great Britain and the United States pleaded military exigencies as an excuse for not abolishing the anti-Jewish discrimination of the White Paper and not fulfilling the explicit obligations imposed on Great Britain by the Mandate, we were patient. All the time that Great Britain was bribing the Arab states, by gifts of political power and prestige, not to join the Axis, we were patient. Palestine Jewry supported the British war effort, and its chief grievance against Great Britain was her reluctance to permit it to fight under its own colors and to mobilize to the utmost. But we are not going to wait patiently while Great Britain sells us to the Arabs as she sold Czechoslovakia to the Germans before the war.

The war is over. Military expediency is no longer a determining factor. Consideration for the Arab states has no justification, since they have neither a legal nor a moral right to interfere in Palestinian affairs. Concern for the welfare of the Arabs in Palestine *is* a consideration, but it is one that does not enter into British imperial politics. For the British Labor cabinet knows well that the native Arabs of Palestine would fare better under a Jewish Palestine than under the undemocratic rule of their feudal lords. It is obvious that British imperialism is using the Arab demands as a screen to mask its own interests. Great Britain's virtual alliance with the Arab states is an alliance with the promoters of massacres and "holy wars."

No, we will not be patient. If the British government is determined to impose its treacherous and murderous policy, it must not expect the Yishuv to remain passive under such tyranny. We are certain that the Jewish community of Palestine will not feel morally bound to cooperate with the iniquitous regime set up

by the British government. The Jews of Palestine will be justified in using every means at their disposal to rescue their fellow Jews from the hell of Europe, and we in America will be justified in giving them every moral and material support in these efforts.

No, we will not be patient. We will cry the shame of British imperialism from the housetops. We will rouse public opinion in Greate Britain, in America, wherever our voice can reach, to the infamy of her betrayal of the Jews. We will expose the personal share of all who figure in that betrayal. We will rally to our banner all men of good will, Christian as well as Jewish, who love liberty, who cherish international good-faith, who value human lives above oil concessions and human liberty above the ambitious schemes of puppet princes. Nothing will stop us but an abrogation by Great Britain of the cynical and cruel policy of the White Paper and a fulfilment in letter and spirit of the obligations undertaken in the Balfour Declaration.

AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE "AS USUAL"

LOOKING back over the war years at the American-Jewish community, one is compelled to recognize that the Jews of the United States underwent very few changes resulting from the war situation itself. Community life, Zionism, religious activities, cultural work show no fundamental effects of the global conflict. Where there was inactivity before, it has remained; where there was dissension before, it too has remained. Here and there, organizations have intensified and expanded their work, but this expansion has been along the same lines previously taken. There have been no startling innovations.

The same may be said of the American Jewish scene since the cessation of hostilities. In the field of religion, the end of fighting was the signal for many thanksgiving services. But close observers doubt very much whether there has been a genuine revival of religious interest. Many are the parents who went to synagogue while their sons were under fire, and stopped going when their sons were reported definitely safe. Many are the GI's who attended services out of nostalgia, who are already lapsing back into their accustomed indifference. Among the leaders of religion, one may detect the same monotonous dearth of new ideas, fresh insights, or courageous self-criticism. On an otherwise unexciting scene, Jews must get their thrill from the news that Dr. Morgenstern of Hebrew Union College is no longer *anti-*, he is now *non-Zionist.*

On Zionist circles, an uneasy peace has descended. Dr. Silver and his associates have been brought back into the active leadership; but while hostilities have ceased, true reconciliaton hardly prevails among the various factions. Yet, even this peace is highly to be cherished, in view of the vicious and desperate efforts being made by the American Council for Judaism to wreck Zionist hopes and smear American Zionists. The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith would do well to adopt the suggestion of the Seattle B'nai B'rith lodge, to take action against the American Council for Judaism for defaming the Jews. Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive director of the Council, says that Jews must choose whether they are Americans first or Jews-first. Zionists, he says, are not Americans first. No wonder that Gerald L. K. Smith, in his notorious "The Cross and the Flag," takes Rabbi Berger to his breast. "Rabbi Berger seems to be an America Firster," writes Smith. Berger and his crowd may be only pesky mos-

quitoes; but mosquitoes can give you *kadahat.*

In community affairs, the last few months have brought to the surface a recurrence of the national budgeting threat. The Executive Committee of the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds has decided to present to the General Assembly, in early 1946, a proposal to set up a National Budgeting Advisory Committee. Once again, the forces for positive Jewish life, the Zionists, the educators, the Hebraists, the Jewishly Jewish social workers are lined up against the proposal. They know what national budgeting means: placing in the hands of a small committee of "neutral" men (for *neutral,* read: *cool to positive survivalist activities*) the power to "suggest" (for *suggest,* read: *hand out authoritative findings*) to various communities how they shall allocate their funds. If such national budgeting went into effect, the local communities would tend to surrender their individual judgment, and rely upon what they would regard as more competent investigation of the relative merits of Jewish causes. Under present leadership in the Council of Federations and Welfare Funds, this would tend to starve out Zionist and cultural activities. The plan should be defeated.

That the ethical standards of Jews can be raised by Jewish organized effort was dramatically illustrated when the Community Service Department of the Anti-Defamation League carried through successfully a plan to "clean up" a certain section of Chicago. When 12,000 Army Air Corps trainees were quartered close to a street notorious for its sharp commercial tactics, the Community Service Department stepped in, and, through a clever application of the principle of self-discipline, revolutionized the character of that street. The South State Street Merchants Association might very well be duplicated in all the large centers of the United States.

But the very success of this effort on the part of the Community Service Department of the Anti-Defamation League brings into sharp relief the lack of properly organized Jewish community set-up. There is no reason why a subsection of a Jewish fraternal order should be responsible for carrying out what is fraternally the job of, and the concern of the entire Jewish people. This small group may be doing a valiant piece of work, but in the light of an over-all program of American Jewish life, it is merely *filling in* for responsible and democratic *kehillot.* In the crucial period just ended, little progress has been made toward creating such community. If the emergency of the war years may be given as a more or less legitimate excuse for the failurue to advance on the road to community organization, the pressing needs of the post-war period are certainly reason enough for American Jewry to bestir itself in that direction at once.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE COMPASSIONATE HEART of religious Americans is revealed in the appeal submitted to President Truman by fifteen national religious organizations included among a larger group known as Food For Freedom. The appeal calls upon the President to relieve the starvation which millions in Europe face this winter. "We ask that you direct the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside the maximum amount of food that we can send to our friends overseas so they can sooner take care of themselves. . . . We ask that the essential foods released by army cutbacks be used to fulfill our promises of help before they (the foods) are allowed to flow into the rapidly-increasing domestic supply." There is, however, more than

charity involved in this appeal; there is also good statesmanship. Lewis Mumford has said, "Our greedy return to a high diet, at the moment when the rest of the world is suffering from malnutrition, often outright starvation, may in fact undo many of the real gains we have made toward international cooperation."

▼

THE AMERICAN ZIONIST EMergency Council has released the text of a wire sent by the Mufti to Hitler in 1942. "The Arab people," he wrote, "will further continue to fight on your side against the common enemy up to ultimate victory." Does not this telegram make the "Arab people" part of the Axis? Since when do we take ex-Axis members into the United Nations Organization? And since when is it sane or proper to penalize devoted friends like the Jews, and reward avowed enemies like the Arabs? These questions should not only be asked in general; they should be directed toward the British and American governments. Now is the time for all Americans to protest with full vigor against the leaders who keep the doors of Palestine closed, and prevent the Mandate from being fulfilled.

▼

THE GOLDEN RULE FOUNDAtion has brought to light again the "spiritual will and testament" of Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz, the wizard inventor. He wrote: "I think the greatest discovery will be made along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of men and history. Yet we have merely been playing with it and have never seriously studied it as we have the physical forces. Some day people will learn that material things do not bring happiness and are of little use in making men and women creative and powerful. Then the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and spiritual forces, which as yet have hardly been scratched. When this day comes, the world will see more advancement in one generation than it has seen in the last four." True. If man investigated how to release the energies of religion, as they have learned to release the physical energy of the atom, this world would be a different place to live in. Who possesses the imagination—and the means—to set up the laboratories?

▼

THE SITUATION OF THE JEWS whom the end of the war found in German concentration camps or in hiding or flight from such a fate is not an enviable one. Without occupation, without a home, half-starved and disease-ridden, they are far from free, in spite of liberation. But nobody can say that they are not receiving attention. At President Truman's suggestion, General Eisenhower has been making a personal survey of these camps, accompanied by General Patton, and has been reassuring the internees of the military government's interest in their welfare. UNRRA has invited both the American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Conference to send representatives abroad to aid in the work of rehabilitation. No doubt we may expect some amelioration of their lot when these American Jewish *shelihim* arrive, but what the internees really need is indicated by the following facts about those in the American Zone of occupation: 85 per cent of them are Polish Jews; only five per cent want to be repatriated; almost all the others would like to emigrate to Palestine. Until this hope can be fulfilled, whatever else can be done for them is merely palliative.

▼

MEANWHILE THE UNITED States has its own refugee inter-

(*Continued on Page* 20)

The All-Day Jewish School

By SAMUEL DININ

DURING the past few years there has been a decided crease in the number of all-day Jewish hools in this country. There are today Jewish all-day schools in the United ates in 26 communities, with an enrollnt of about 9,000 pupils. Of the 65 hools, 37 are in New York City. In 1943 re were in New York City, 37 all-day hools with a population of 6,825 as ainst 4,290 pupils in 16 schools in 1935, presenting an *increase of about* 55 *per nt.**

The all-day school has won adherents t only among Orthodox Jews but also long Conservative Jews and Zionists. any see in the all-day Jewish school only solution to the problem of Jeweducation in this country. The rapid ead of the all-day school is taken as indication that American Jewry is dy to espouse this form of intensive wish education, and in many communithere is an eagerness to begin the rk of establishing one or more all-day ools. Reconstructionists in several comnities have asked the Reconstruction-Board for guidance in this matter, and nt to know what its stand is on this blem. Because of widespread interest the subject of all-day Jewish schools, are taking this means of stating our nt of view as a basis for further dission among our readers.

All-Day Jewish School—A Partial ution at Best

We should like to put aside for the ment the question of whether or not all-day Jewish school is feasible, defensible, or desirable, and consider instead the question whether it *can* become the dominant form of Jewish education in this country. On the basis of present trends, and leaving aside wishes and preferences in the matter, it can be soberly stated that the possibilities are that the all-day Jewish school will at best attract a small percentage of the Jewish child population in this country.

The 9,000 children who attend the 65 all-day Jewish schools constitute only 4.6 per cent of the Jewish child population receiving a Jewish education and only a little over 1 per cent of all Jewish children of school age (using 800,000 as the number of Jewish children in this country between the ages of 5-14.) Even if the number of children attending all-day schools were doubled, this would still make the proportion of children attending such schools less than 10 per cent of the total receiving a Jewish education, and from 2 to 3 per cent of the total Jewish child population. One hundred and thirty day-schools with an enrollment of 20,000 (assuming a 100 per cent increase in the next decade) would have a significance and importance altogether out of proportion to their number, but they would still affect only a small percentage of Jews and Jewish children in this country. This does not, or should not absolve us from the duty of trying to double the number of all-day schools, if we believe they have a contribution to make. (But of this further on.) We cite these figures to quiet those who fear the spread of the all-day Jewish schools and to sober those who let their enthusiasm for this new-found panacea dull their sense of reality.

Our conclusion is also based on the fact

*See N. Nardi: *A Survey of Jewish Day ools in America,* Jewish Education, Vol. 16, 1.

that the trend in American life is away from the parochial school to the common school, and that American Jews will follow the dominant trend. It is interesting to note that the majority of Americans are unaffiliated with any church. The 256 religious bodies in the United States claim only 43.46 per cent of the population (all the Protestant groups constitute 23 per cent of the total, all the Catholic groups 16 per cent, all the Jewish groups less than 4 per cent, and all the other cults less than 1 per cent). If anything, these figures are too optimistic—e.g., all the Jews are included, although we know that only a portion of them is affiliated with some religious body. The Christians, though normally constituting a vast majority in this country, are actually a minority group, viewed from the point of affiliation alone.*

The United States Office of Education in 1937-8 reported that there were 19,141,120 pupils in public elementary schools, including Junior High Schools, and 2,240,650 pupils in 9,992 private and parochial schools (about 10 per cent of the total). There were 1,630,110 pupils in 5,795 Roman Catholic schools, constituting an estimated 35 per cent of the Catholic child population of 4,600,000 and a total Catholic population of 23,000,000. Twenty-two other Christian denominations conducted 2,004 parochial schools which had 132,038 pupils (.8 per cent of the total), and 440,016 or 2 per cent of the total number attending public, private and parochial schools attended private schools, (Nardi, ibid).

It is evident from these figures that the trend is away from the parochial school. The parochial school is practically non-existent among the Protestant groups. But even among the Catholics, there is a decided trend away from it. The peak in parochial school enrollment was reached around 1926 when about 48 per cent of the Catholic child population between the ages of 5-17 were enrolled in parish schools. There is a similarity between the Catholic civilization and the Jewish civilization and there are elements in the Jewish population, particularly among the Orthodox Jews, who feel the need for all-day Jewish schools on the same basis as the Catholics. But the vast majority of Jews in this country are not affected by Catholic trends but follow the trends of the Protestant majority. The fact that as many as 35 per cent of the Catholic children (some estimates are as high as 40 per cent) attend a parochial school can, of course, be a source of hope to those desiring to spread the idea of the all-day Jewish school. However, they should not be misled. For one thing, even among the Catholics the trend is downward. Moreover, the vast majority of the Jews are religiously unaffiliated. In large Catholic centers, and in centers where there is a large Orthodox population, it may be possible to establish all-day Jewish schools in a friendly environment. For the most part, however, it will not be possible to get the vast majority of Jewish parents to send their children to all-day Jewish schools. It must be remembered that only 10 per cent of all American children (including the Catholics) attend a private or parochial school. The Jews may get more than .8 per cent of their children to attend all-day schools (the Protestant percentage); they are hardly likely to go above 2 or 3 per cent (2 per cent being the percentage of private school pupils in this country) for the whole Jewish child population of about 800,000.

* See *School and Church*, by Conrad Henry Moehlman, Harper & Bros.

The Parochial School and the American Way

For better or for worse the American tradition is against the parochial school and on the side of the common school. This is due to many factors, some of which will be considered here. The separation of Church and State is definitely part of the American way of life. The basis of the separation of Church and State in this country is the First Amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1791, which states that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust inside the United States." This amendment was designed "to cut off forever every pretense of any alliance between Church and State in the national government," and to exclude all rivalry among Christian sects and to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to any hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government." (Moehlman, ibid p. 51). As a result of this separation of Church and State, Christianity has ceased to be the official religion of any state in the Union. However, the United States, because the vast majority of its citizens are Christians, is in the Christian tradition. Christianity has not only influenced the development of the common law, the ethical traditions, etc., it also penetrates in subtle ways into the common school and the national and state governments. (The problems thus created for non-Christians are treated elsewhere.)

The common school is the educational instrument which democracy has developed to train its citizens for living in a country in which the national government and its resources are separated from church control. The emergence of the common school was gradual, and its universalization was achieved only after a long drawn out struggle which was a part of the general struggle for the development of democratic institutions. It is not necessary to chronicle the history of the common school. What should be emphasized is that the First Amendment profoundly affected and finally abolished the religious restrictions originally permitted in the several states. Thus Jefferson's School Bill was an omen of things to come: "But no religious reading, instruction or exercise should be prescribed or practiced, inconsistent with the tenets of any religious sect or denomination" (See Moehlman, ibid p. 84). Religious elements have not been altogether removed in all of the states, but the trend has been in that direction. Most of the states have constitutional provisions against religious tests and against appropriations for religious ends. One third of them have provisions against religious instruction in the public schools.

The common school has become the symbol and the promise of democracy and the American way of life. What is more, though for the most part the common school has been freed of religious sectarianism, and though direct religious education is recognized as the burden of the churches, "American public education emancipated from sectarianism is indirectly the only universal teacher of religious values in the United States." (Moehlman, ibid p. 85). This is the conclusion of a minister of religion, and not of a layman. Elsewhere Moehlman states that "to call public education 'godless' betrays invincible ignorance, infinite prejudice, and complete misunderstanding of what religion is about." (Ibid p. 98)

The public school may not teach religion directly, but it has always inculcated religious ethical attitudes indirectly. It is the one place where religious and social tolerance is cultivated. "It is America's protection against numerous ef-

forts to stir up religious prejudice and inaugurate a new inquisition." (Ibid p. 120). However one defines the objectives of public education, one will find that for the most part they are religious objectives and values as well. The common school, like religion, wants self-realization, the development of human relationships, economic efficiency and responsibility, worthy home membership, worthy use of leisure time, health, ethical character, to cite only a few of the objectives included in formulations of educational aims.

On its part, contemporary public education has a formidable case against parochial schools and parochial school systems. The parochial school is separationist and makes for segregation. It is narrowly sectarian and dogmatic. Many parochial schools lack competent teachers and adequate equipment. The parochial school curriculum is too often old-fashioned and unflexible and not adapted to contemporary needs.

This list of indictments against the parochial schools could be extended. The essential thing is that America and Americans are committed to the common school. It has its faults; it is far from perfect, but it is the best guarantee of our democracy and of our future as a democratic nation.

Toleration of Parochial Schools Also Part of the American Way

Despite what has been said about the common school, it is necessary to state emphatically that, paradoxical as it may seem, the parochial school exists as of right and not on sufferance, and that toleration of the parochial school is itself part of the American way. This should dispose of any attempt to label the parochial school "un-American."

The Catholic case for the parochial school is strong and unmistakable and is clearly set forth in the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI on the Christian Education of Youth. Education belongs to the Catholic Church, which alone has the whole of moral truth. "Every method of education founded wholly or in part on the denial or forgetfulness of original sin and grace and relying on the powers of human nature is unsound." Religion cannot be divorced from education and no moral principles can be taught without religion. With this view as a premise, it is no surprise that the Catholic Church is opposed to schools of a mixed Catholic and non-Catholic student and teacher personnel, even though students of the different denominations are provided with separate religious instruction. It feels that the state cannot justly compel Catholics to support non-Catholic schools, that on the contrary, the payment of taxes gives parents the right to determine the character of the schools attended by their children.

The common school may be good enough in certain respects, but in others it is considered exceedingly harmful for Catholic children. It has been called godless, sectarian, favoring Protestantism in the use and interpretation of the Bible. The Pope in his letter is opposed to the self-government-by-the-child theory of education, to co-education founded on a naturalism which fails to recognize original sin, to sex instruction given by those who do not hold a commission from God to teach, and to other practices in contemporary education.

The Catholic Church does recognize that, under certain circumstances, Catholic parents may have to send their children to public schools and to schools of mixed Catholic and non-Catholic population, and it permits such attendance in certain cases, provided parents do not neglect the duty of instructing the children and training them in all that pertains to Catholic worship and life. As we

e seen, the vast majority of Catholic ldren in the United States do not at- parochial schools. There are, too, y Catholics who, as Americans, favor common school and are opposed to ochial schools. But the official attitude the Catholic hierachy remains as ed.

he case of the Catholics against pub- ducation is not altogether groundless. t some aspects of it have merit is e out by the fact that an increasing liness has been evinced of late to t some of the Catholic demands. s the Report of the President's Ad- y Committee on Education in Feb- y, 1938, stated: "Consideration ld be given, however, to the fact that e numbers of children receive instruc- in non-public schools, and that the ntenance of schools under non-public ices results in significant reduction in ic expense. Many of the services of ic schools should be available to chil- regardless of whether they are en- d in public schools for instruction. , therefore, recommended that such ions of the general aid as may be cated in the joint plans to the pur- e of reading materials, transportation scholarships be made available, so far ederal legislation is concerned, for benefit of pupils both in public and non-public schools. The Committee recommends that local public schools iving Federal aid be authorized to e their health and welfare services lable to pupils in non-public schools. conditions under which health and are services and aid for reading ma- ls, transportation, and scholarships be made available for pupils in pri- ly controlled schools should be deter- ed by the States or by the local school diction receiving the grants of the s." (Quoted by Moehlman, ibid pp.).

In many communities free transportation, free milk and lunches and other services provided for children in public schools are given to children in parochial and private schools as well.

There is, too, an increasing recognition that the public school must do something about instruction in religion. Though there is, for the most part, a desire to retain the principle of separation of church and state, there is at the same time a feeling that, within the framework of the common school, some way must be found to permit the children to get some instruction in religion. The released time plan, which is being tried out in many communities, is one such plan which aims at this objective. The time allocated is hardly adequate to do justice to religious instruction, but it is a token and an earnest of an obligation and a need.

Some religious leaders, both among Jews and among Christians, have advocated the teaching in the public schools of some common American religion. Given certain premises, the scheme has some logic and some attraction. One has only to read Dr. Moehlman's chapter on "Can the Bible Return to the Classroom?" to see how difficult, nay, how preposterous such a plan is at the present time. In this chapter he shows what a teacher would have to face in teaching a common course in the Bible or in religion. There are over 250 different religious groups, each requiring a different kind of handling. They all have their own textual versions and interpretations of the Bible, their own prayers, their own basic teachings. Protestant sectarianism and the historical method of interpreting the Bible will alone make it impossible to recreate the educational system of colonial days. Dr. Moehlman feels that, in addition, such an attempt to impose formal religious instruction upon education

would be self-destructive, because of the fact that religious education is in a state of decline and to pass it over to public education would signify its complete cancellation. "Serious-minded lay leaders are today asking why the churches should be exempt from taxation if all they do for the community is to conduct public worship for two hours once a week. For the churches to abandon religious education to the day schools would be suicidal." (Moehlman, ibid p. 131).

There is criticism of the common school in other than religious quarters. Marie Syrkin in her recent work "Your Schools, Your Children," indicts the schools, among other things, for failure to teach racial tolerance, for their shortcomings as teachers and guarantors of democracy, and cites examples of Jim-Crowism and anti-Semitism in the public schools. But though she voices these criticisms, she still has faith in the common school and would not abandon it. She merely wishes it to become a more effective instrument of democratic learning and living.

The Jewish All-Day School—Parochial or Private?

In the light of all this, what case can be made out for the all-day Jewish school? In the first place, it has been asserted that the Jewish all-day school is not a parochial school in the usual sense of the word. "The term 'parochial' cannot apply to Jewish all-day schools because the Jews have no centralized authority to control education. In its original meaning among Catholics, the word 'parochial' implies ownership of the school by the Parish or in a larger sense, by the Church, which has even opposed the State's right to control education." (Nardi, ibid p. 13). There is an insistence that the Jewish all-day schools are private and that Jews organize all-day schools not because they deny the right of the State to educate their children, b rather because they find the public scho insufficient for the educational needs their children. In the narrow sense which the word "parochial" is used, th may be true of Jewish all-day schoo But in another sense, it is not at all tru The truth is that there are all kinds Jewish all-day schools. The tradition Yeshivot are, for the most part, "par chial" in that their adherents too fe (whether they articulate their feeling not) that the public school is "godless that its education is incompatible wi divine revelation, that its secular atmo phere is not conducive to living the goo Jewish life as believed in and practice by Orthodox Jews.

There are "modern" Yeshivot to whi parents send their children for a varie of reasons. There are reasons of health- parents do not want their children attend a supplementary school in t afternoon after a long day in the publ school. There is dissatisfaction with t instruction given in the public school f reasons given in Marie Syrkin's book ar for other reasons as well. Some paren send their children to a good Jewi all-day school for social-economic reaso because of prestige, or because the a day school is to them merely a progressi private school. Some are concerned abo the dualism which is created by atten ance at a public school and a supplem tary Hebrew School, and see in the Je ish all-day school a way of integrati the Jewish and secular instruction giv in the interest of developing an integrat personality in the child. But the mo compelling reason seems to be the inad quacy of the instruction at present giv in weekday Jewish schools. Not only h the number of Talmud Torahs decrease not only has the resultant increase in t number of other types of weekday schoo particularly of congregational schoo

ght about a decrease in the amount, and intensity of the Jewish educa- given in these schools; but the mud Torahs themselves are failing in r task. Elimination of pupils before luation still proceeds in the Talmud ahs at an alarming pace. Only a small entage of those who enter a Talmud ah ever graduate.

ecause of the cost involved, because he sentiment for the common school, use of the influence of the environ- t, and for other reasons, only a small entage of Jewish parents in this ntry will send their children to all- schools. Why then the increase in the ber of all-day schools in recent s? (We shall examine the nature of increase further on). Because of the nt influx of Orthodox Jews and Or- dox leaders from Eastern and Central pe, because American Orthodoxy come of age and become better or- zed and more militant, there has been ncrease in the number of traditional nivot. Because of the dissatisfaction present weekday Jewish instruction for other reasons mentioned, there been an increase, too, in the number "modern" all-day schools. However, e is a limit to the growth of the Jew- all-day schools, as has been indicated. question is whether, within those ts, we should proceed to set up all- schools.

regation vs. milation

s a general proposition, a good case be made out against the all-day ool. On the face of it, it is not in sonance with the best interests of de- racy and of liberal religion. It is di- ve and makes for segregation. The e of religion taught in the traditional hivot is fundamentalist; in some of the odern" Yeshivot, the problem of religion is evaded or taught noncommittally or in the traditional manner. The desire to establish all-day schools is, in a sense, a confession of the bankruptcy of our Jewish life and of Jewish education in America. It is the application of a remedy which will not cure the basic malady of Jewish life. If Jewish parents were really interested in Jewish survival and in giving their children an intensive Jewish education, they would see to it that their children were enrolled at an early age in our supplementary schools and kept there continuously over a period of years, until the Jewish education received would have a chance of making some effect on the children.

As against this the protagonists of the all-day school have some formidable arguments on their side. The fact is that the weekday schools, even at their best, are ineffective when it comes to the transmission of the Jewish heritage. It is impossible to learn the classic and modern literature of the Jewish people and become an heir to the complete civilization through a few hours a week of study stretched over a few short years. Unless we acquire a complete at-homeness in Jewish civilization, it is difficult to withstand the corrosive effects of assimilation. One of the functions of democracy is to make America safe for differences, to allow for free communication between different individuals and groups within the framework of a community. If such free and full communication between the Jewish and other groups is to enrich American life, the Jewish group must be constituted of Jews who are truly Jewish and are not merely individuals of Jewish extraction, more or less assimilated. The race between Jewishness and assimilation is unequal as it is, even in the case of graduates of all-day schools. Our numbers are small and the blandishments of the environment are difficult to with-

stand. Then again, as long as public schooling is inadequate, as long as attendance at two schools makes for a dualism between American and Jewish life, and is injurious to the health of our children, as long as these and other factors obtain, there will be justification for those who want to send their children to an all-day school.

Traditional vs. Modern All-Day Schools

Though a good case can be made out for Jewish all-day schools, this does not mean that any and every all-day school is good. In fact, some of the recent increase in the number of all-day schools is the result of decidedly unhealthy conditions. All-day schools have been organized in many sections of New York City and elsewhere where there was no immediate warrant for such an establishment, largely because of the over-zealousness or over-militancy of some individual or group. Of the thirty-seven all-day schools in New York City, about half have an enrollment of less than 100 children, 7 schools have an enrollment of 49 pupils or less and 9 schools have an enrollment of 100 pupils or less. Schools are often started with a few pupils, and with little money on hand to cover expenses. Once a school is started, the directors send out a heart-rending appeal through the press or by mail, calling on the Jews to save their institution. Fund-raising campaigns for building and maintenance are launched. The Yiddish press lends itself to these drives and appeals. One Yiddish paper, so I am told, by making available its columns of publicity and by aiding in the promotion of the campaign, received as much as 25 per cent of the total amount raised in this way. Often no study is made before hand of the need for an all-day school in a particular locality and of the ability of the local community to defray the c of keeping up such a school and provi ing for continued growth and expansi

Similarly, in practically all of the tra tional Yeshivot, there is no attempt ma at integration of subject matter. T secular subjects are taught at one peri during the day by one group of teac ers; the Jewish subjects are taught at different time by teachers of Jewish su ject-matter.

There is, too, no attempt to deal wi the problem of segregation, by providi for inter-cultural and inter-social und standing. The traditional subjects a taught in the traditional ways, exce that more time is available for Hebre Biblical and Talmudic studies than in t Talmud Torahs.

Some Concluding Observations

What then is the sum of all our o servations and considerations? I shall t to state these concluding observations a series of summary propositions:

1. The common school has come be the cornerstone of our democracy. Americans there is nothing we can do would want to do to change the basis American education. We recognize th the public school has its shortcomin and failures. As Americans we must everything in our power to remove the shortcomings—to fight for equalizati of educational opportunity, for elimin tion of racial prejudice, for reduci over-size classes, for provision of ma facilities now inadequately provided f —psychological, vocational, remedi etc.; in short to make the common scho so good that there will be no need f private schools as distinct from parochi schools.

2. Despite the place the comm school holds in American life, the par

hial school has a legitimate role and unction in American life. As Americans re should recognize the additional burens placed upon parents sending their hildren to parochial schools and should ry to lessen these burdens in so far as gally possible, at least to the extent of roviding free bus transportation, free ilk, etc., when such services are exnded to children attending the public chools.

3. Our democracy and our common chool may be founded on the principle f separation of Church and State, but e, as Americans and as Jews, recognize he incompleteness of life and education ithout religion. Specific religious teachngs can best be transmitted through supplementary religious schools. The comon school, however, is interested in the hole child and has a proper concern r religious and ethical teachings, even ough it is precluded from teaching sectarian programs of religion. Jews should in with non-Jews in exploiting the posbilities of plans and programs, such as e Released Time Plan, which seek to ake religious teaching more effective nd more accessible within the limits of e common school set-up.

4. The Jewish all-day school has the me excuse for being as any parochial hool and more excuse than any private hool. The private school exists because ublic schooling is inadequate, or for asons of socio-economic snobbishness nd prestige. The Jewish all-day school concerned with the problem of Jewish rvival in this country, with integrating e secular and Jewish knowledge of the ild, with the transmission and integran of two rich civilizations. For ecomic and for other reasons, Jewish all-y schools will never become widead, and will at best reach a small oportion of our Jewish child populan. But this small number can be of inestimable value to the future of Israel and to the future of democracy. For these all-day schools can produce the informed and intelligent lay, rabbinic and communal leaders without whom creative survival in this country is unthinkable.

5. As Jews, we should, within the Jewish community, try to equalize Jewish educational opportunity for those children whose parents want them to attend a Jewish all-day school. We should extend financial aid to those who wish to attend an all-day school but cannot because of lack of funds. We should try to exercise some control over the organization and financing of all-day schools in the direction of greater responsibility. We should discourage the allocation of community funds to such schools unless there is a responsible board, capable of supporting the venture in large measure and able to demonstrate the need and desire for such a school in a given locality.

6. As Reconstructionists, we should seek to foster and support the kind of all day school which is in line with the general direction of our program and thinking—a school which tries to integrate the secular and Jewish subjects; a school which tries to make up for the segregationist tendency of its very set-up by providing frequent contacts of its children with other Jewish and non-Jewish groups in the community; a school which lays due stress on the Hebrew element in the Jewish civilization and on the role of Palestine in our present and future life; a school which tries to teach a view of religion and Jewish history which is intellectually defensible and compelling; a school which tries to inculcate in its charges a sense of the Jewish community and of Jewish peoplehood; a school which tries to teach Torah not as a blind alley but as a thoroughfare leading to the enrichment of the personal life of the

Jewish child and to the goal of a just and better world.

7. We must, moreover, recognize that a handful of all-day schools cannot of themselves effect a basic change in the future character of the Jewish group in the United States. Unless we can get Jews to want to live gladly as Jews and to send their children to a Jewish school for as many years as they attend a public school, we shall be rearing in the all-day schools a head without a body, leaders without a following. We must, to the best of our ability, work for the type of Jewish community organization and of synagogue organization, and for the kind of religious outlook and of Jewish education which will rouse Jews to the beauty of their heritage and to their resposibilities as Jews.

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 10)

nees. During the war, 982 persons who had escaped Nazi persecution were admitted temporarily to this country and given a haven in Fort Ontario at Oswego, N. Y. An organization known as the Friends of Fort Ontario Guest Refugees has proposed to the government (1) that the Fort Ontario refugees be given immediate freedom of movement and residence in the United States, (2) that they be given equal opportunity with other prospective immigrants for legal entry into the country under existing national quotas, and (3) that none shall be repatriated against his will. Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York is supporting these demands which are receiving consideration by the various departments of the government concerned. There are, of course, difficulties presented by those who are ready to raise the cry that the government has been acting in bad faith in that it admitted these refugees as temporary guests, but now proposes to accept them as permanent residents. But such considerations should not overbalance common sense and common humanity. Why should the mere fact that these persons are now in the country militate against their becoming permanent legal residents?

▼

WE HAVE RECEIVED A VERY INteresting letter from Chaplain Morris Gordon, from which we quote the following: "At Chengtu, while I was making arrangements for the High Holidays, I was invited to dinner at the home of Dr. W. P. Chen, a noted minister and scholar. The home is situated on the Campus of Wa-shi-ba University. . . . The charming hostess at dinner was Mrs. Chen, daughter-in-law of Dr. Chen and teacher of dancing at the University. Following dinner, a flock of Chinese college students, male and female, stepped in to visit their popular instructress, Mrs. Chen. . . . I naturally asked that she demonstrate some of the dances taught at the University. They asked me to reciprocate with something from America. I soon learned that . . . they could teach me a few things about American dancing. All my endeavors to teach them something were now seen to be of no avail. Suddenly, as if by some miracle of mental telepathy, the bright blue cover of the *New Palestine* flashed across my mind. The creative hand of Eretz Yisrael reached out over a tremendous distance to save me from a desperate plight in the heart of China. I taught them how to dance the hora to the singing of *Artzah Alinu*. Their agile feet romped gleefully to the catchy tune. . . . They insisted on learning all the Hebrew words." The Chinese and the Jews are two peoples with ancient civilizations simultaneously experienceing a rebirth. A cultural exchange between them is most appropriate.

The Law*

By ALICE SELIGSBERG

The many-fingered rain lets liquid pebbles slip upon the awning,
And I, trying in vain to sleep, tap the pattern on my cool bare arm.

- - - - - -

Turn over, fall asleep, poor child, and find relief from broken thoughts
Of brothers, fears for youth, grief for the world, its lost morality.
What avenue of thought can I pursue that ends not in despair?
At every transverse where the sun slants through, that moment I can bear
Reviving hope. But no. I see the sunlit road denied to you.

- - - - - -

How soon to me?

- - - - - -

Has creed enforced by church or state made mankind merciful or just?
They both use evil means to fix all men in uniformity:—
Purges and torture, inquisition, pitiless massacres of babes,
Sadistic orgies, cold pogroms, gas for non-combatants and bombs
Are rationalized by pseudo-Christian civilization for its ends.
There is no evil it does not defend for the sake of a holy cause.

- - - - - -

Brothers and sisters in this hell that man has made of life on earth,—
Despite earth's loveliness of sight and sound, fragrance and delicate touch,
Moss at our feet and stars above, tides and the phases of the moon,
Feel of mist on the face, song of lark, scent of the earth after rain,—
If we perish, we are done. But let us go chanting for all to hear:
We still have faith in moral law for every nation, every soul;
That Law evolved to establish righteousness on earth, ignoring not
The individual, but stressing his relations to other men.

- - - - - -

I cannot sleep. The rain still falls. O Source of many-fingered rain
Open thy hands. Let the deluge come since come it must.
But somewhere
On some Ararat again **preserve the seeds of wisdom and of law,**
That all new-born into a chastened world may know the Law, thereby
To build a commonwealth where every man will be secure and free.
Then will great truth be vindicated and man ascend to higher deeds.

* This poem was written in Palestine by the author during her last illness, and was occasioned by the Nazi outrages in 1938. It has recently been brought to our attention and we are pleased to publish it both because of the appropriateness of its theme to Simhat Torah and because of the relevance of its thought to the present world situation.—Editors.

Is Orthodoxy Consistent With Democracy?

By SIDNEY MORGENBESSE

THE declaration of the committee of Orthodox rabbis in condemnation of Dr. Kaplan and the Reconstructionist Prayer Book has much to commend it. It is strong, positive and clear. In contradistinction to most pronouncements of Jewish leaders upon theological matters, there is no doubt but that the authors are convinced that God is on their side. Furthermore, its issuance was accompanied by a ceremony of pomp, circumstance and fire. Since practically nothing done by Jews seems to be of any avail in revitalizing interest in Judaism, a good old bonfire may be what is needed. However, the attempt seemed to have been not quite good enough. As far as one can forsee, the end of the war was not hastened, the colors of the skies did not change and no Messiah was seen riding on a white horse. Even in nearby cities such as Philadelphia, for every Jew who discussed this action, 50,000 remained oblivious of the existence of this Holy Jewish Empire. Perhaps the action was not quite glamorous enough —the Nazis burned thousands of books, not merely one. These and similar details make the action appear in its true light— the attempt of an old guard to strangle the birth of anything new.

The Case for the Orthodox Rabbinate

Enlightenment is a mixed blessing. Every enlightenment is a disillusionment. Chemists were not as secure when they learned that matter could disintegrate. A certain world picture was being erased, and habits of thought had consequently to be altered. Children are disillusioned when they learn that papa is not the strongest man in the world, the ancients were disappointed when prayers to sticks and stones did not assure victories ove their enemies, and the Egyptians, whe they learned that not all rivers flowe in the same direction as the Nile.

In matters of fact, evidence provide by experience may at times cause us t alter our analysis of what actually exist It is much harder to reach a decison t make changes in theories that have bee built up on inferences from beliefs tha have long been taken for granted. Ever proposal to alter a plank in the system really begging the question. Fundament assumptions are the things that must b debated and debated and debated. I the long run it is not science, it is a that causes us to change our fundament premises.

Involved in the decisions of the Ortl odox rabbinate are the fundamental a sumptions of traditional Judaism, the pi ture of the cosmos and the place of th Jew therein as these rabbis see it. *"D Bild"* as the Germans would say is clea The Torah which is God's gift to Isra is the fundamental word. It and it alon contains the correct descriptions of th methods of living. Jews are great not a result of any inherent biological mat rial but as a result of the possession the Torah. Incidentally, the Torah con prises not merely the five Books of Mos but the entire gamut of literature know as *Torah Sheb'al Peh.* God can only b defined implicitly; that is, the descriptio of God found in the Torah are by defin tion true, and God can only be define as the sum-total of all the statemen made about him in the Torah. Whoeve denies any one of the statements therefore, necessarily heretical a atheistic. Furthermore, no real chan can be introduced by men. Change is val

and only if, it is in accord with cer- statements of the Torah or deduc- ns from such statements.

To be sure, to an outsider this picture y appear very smuggish, every Jew ng assured that his people is in some se chosen. In reality, Jews who upheld doctrine, who lived and died for it, re humble in the finest sense of the n. Personally they were insignificant; ir worth as individuals was negligible; was Torah and only Torah that was gnificent.

No one can deny the beauty of the sys- . It is clear and definitive, and most stions in regard to Jewish living can answered in terms of these beliefs. thermore, these beliefs are so inter- ned with memories of beautiful child- d events, are so interwoven with the f tenets of personal behavior that it sometimes cruel to cause a man to nquish these beliefs, to be enlightened he eyes of his opponents.

Case for Democracy in Religion

ne can argue whether the action of e rabbis was actually in harmony with classic interpretation of Judaism. One argue that Doctor Kaplan's views are in contradiction to certain statements he Talmud and the Midrash. But Dr. lan does not argue thus, nor is this ll the issue. The issue is simply over democratization of religious forms.

Whatever else democracy consists of, must be allowed—experimentation of vidual groups to reorganize their pat- s of behavior. Insofar as the inno- rs do not harm others or do not coerce rs to follow these new patterns, the rs must not harm or coerce these rimenters. In political matters democ- is parallel to a denial of an *a priori* print of action. It is through give take, through discussion and trust ll sections of people, that we should arrive at a decision. That, in practice, those countries which call themselves democratic do not always follow the principles of democracy is absolutely no contradiction of the validity of the democratic ideal, so long as we can entertain the hope of instituting democracy.

But democracy can be applied to all areas of living. In philosophical systems, its application involves a denial of the necessary wisdom of an ancient tradition. Attention is focused on the fact that philosophical inquiry is instituted for specific causes. Past systems can only be judged from the point of view of their worthwhileness in contributing an answer to these inquiries. In this attempt at clarity every person who desires to clarify may contribute. In other words, students are not there to learn merely to respect what others have said, but to learn why others have said what they have and to be independently able to judge whether what is said is of value.

In economic matters the denial of an *a priori* source of wisdom consists in a denial of the necessary acceptance in advance of a particular economic mode of operation. Capitalism or any other method of economic pursuit is to be seen as an historic attempt to satisfy economic wants. If that attempt fails, the system must be altered—and the only method of judging whether it has failed is by an analysis of the needs of all for whom this system is instituted and by the decision of all whom this institution affects. Similarly in religion. Judaism, Catholicism, or Hinduism are not to be accepted as *a priori* truths but as historic attempts of distinct peoples to figure out their place in the cosmos, to determine what gives value to life and to express and give effect to this sense of values through churches, customs and rites. But no view reached at any time is necessarily the correct answer. New views may be at

hand, and the only persons involved are those who are honestly seeking new horizons. The defenders of the old have no right to proclaim to the protagonists of the new that, by definition, they are wrong.

The Weakness of the Orthodox Case

In the theological field that is the issue. That this is not the greatest problem facing Jews throughout the world today is irrevocable proof that the Jewish identity is not predicated solely on a religious basis. It is strange, however, that even those who are called Orthodox today are far from living up to their accepted doctrine. If Judaism consists in accepting all of the *mitzvot* of the Torah as binding, why should Bialik and Brandeis be recognized as Jews? Why are even the Orthodox so proud of Einstein and Herzl? Seriously, why not excommunicate all Jews who "keep their places of business open" on Saturday? Why not excommunicate all who accept money from such sources? Why not excommunicate all who suspect that the Greeks may have had something to contribute to human values? Why not excommunicate all who may believe that the world is at least 100,000 years old or those who proclaim in public that America is their home and not a temporary purgatory? The truth is that the Orthodox cannot. There would be no one of any consequence left.

Fundamental assumptions are not easily changed but, when no one actually lives according to them, why take for granted that they are necessarily correct? It is admittedly difficult to change habits of thought and interpretation, but that is the only method of progress. Animism, magic, alchemy, all were once very dear. So let us face the issue. Let everyone take his stand. May we experiment or not? If not, why not? How can anyone accept democracy and not admit experimentation? Is there any alternative, but dictatorship, even if it be the pusillanimou dictatorship of those whose only claim to fame is competency in the intricate details of the Schach and the Taz? * I there any alternative but for the Jews t remain a laughing stock in the eyes of al freedom-loving men?

* Abbreviated titles of two commentaries o *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh Deah — Sifete Kohe* and *Ture Zahav.*

Correspondence

ON THE NUMBER OF JEWISH CONVERTS TO CHRISTIANITY

Sirs:

The peculiar conditions of postal delivery i war-time have delayed the reception of you January 26 issue until now.

I was interested in the editorial on page which stated that the editors faced "a dis turbing situation," i.e., the claim of the Com mittee on the Christian Approach to the Jew that 100,000 Jews are members of Christia Churches in the United States and Canada.

Please don't let this disturb you. I spent number of years examining the statistica claims of the organizations whom this Com mittee represents and the system of paddin which is employed would arouse the envy o the most experienced commercial traveller. B Christian Churches, the Committee means Pro testant Christian churches. A very generou estimate would give such churches a mem bership of perhaps 25,000 ex-Jews, mostly ac quired through mixed marriages. The num ber of Gentiles whom we have gained by th same method compensates for the loss.

In my three years in the Army, I have min istered to approximately 20,000 Jewish individ uals. I have also met, during this period, tw soldiers who were avowed "Hebrew Chris tians." I met both of them in the hospital, i fact, in the same section of the hospital, th psychopathic ward. One in ten thousand i not worth getting excited about.

If we must get disturbed, let us feel dis turbed over the de-Judaized Jews that hav not forsaken us. My Army experience has re vealed that the number of Jews who are ab solutely disinterested in our culture and ou religion is very small but the number who ar culturally and religiously ignorant is ver great. The chaplain's stalwarts are almos without exception soldiers with a Europea background plus a sprinkling of men educate in New York Hebrew schools.

DAVID MAX EICHHORN, Chaplai
Army of the United State